

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria. Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/724,033 11/26/2003		Alexei A. Erchak	16459-008001	7277		
23628	7590	07/28/2006		EXAMINER		
		D & SACKS, PC	WON, BI	WON, BUMSUK		
FEDERAL 1 600 ATLAN			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
BOSTON,	MA 02210	0-2206	2879	2879		

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/724,033	ERCHAK ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Bumsuk Won	2879		

	Bumsuk Won	2879						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.								
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)					
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	e of the final rejection.							
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.								
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).								
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	dension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as					
NOTICE OF APPEAL The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complising the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed. 	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the						
AMENDMENTS								
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause					
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);						
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or 		ducing or simplifying	the issues for					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1			(DTO) 00 A					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		impliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the								
 b. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	illowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amending	ent canceling the					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		Il be entered and an o	explanation of					
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-31,33,34,36-39</u> .								
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8.	ut hafara ar on the data of filing a N	otice of Appeal will be	nt he entered					
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and					
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessal 	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a					
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 								
 The request for reconsideration has been considered be <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u> 	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	Vo(s)						
13. Other:		Joseph William	<u>.</u>					
		JOSEPHAN	7					
		PRIMARY EXAN	IAMS IINER					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amendment to claim 1 to include the subject matter requires further consideration since the limitation of claim 5 and 37 were not considered in for the rejection of claims 2-4, 6-31, 33, 34, 36, 38, and 39...

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding argument of the first layer not being in contact with a material comprising gas in pages 9 and 10, the Applicant argues that the first layer of Camras is not in contact with a material comprising gas. The Examiner disagrees. In figures 3A, 5D, 6D, 7A, 7B, 7C, 7D, 7E, 7F and 8, column 7, line 25 - column 8, line 23, and column 12, lines 1-7, Camras discloses the first layer 114 being directly contact with air and superstrate 117, and the bonding layers 126 are optional.

Regarding argument of n-type layer in pages 10-11, the Applicant argues that Camras already has a first layer which is n-type doped. If Camras already anticipates the first layer having n-type doping, the claim is still rejected under 35 USC 102.

Regarding argument of the first layer being less than 10 microns in page 11, the Applicant argues that Lin fails to disclose the first layer is less than 10 microns thick. The Examiner disagrees. Lin discloses a light emitting device (figure 4) that has semiconductor layers (52, 53, 54) being less than 10 microns (column 4, lines 25-42). Also, the Applicant argues that the first layer is not in contact with a material comprising a gas. The Examiner already responded above regarding this argument.

JOSEPH WILLIAMS PRIMARY EXAMINED